

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI  
GREENVILLE DIVISION**

**CALEB RODGERS**

**PLAINTIFF**

**VS.**

**CIVIL ACTION: 4:19-CV-00191-MPM-JMV**

**ROBERT SMART et al.**

**DEFENDANTS**

**ORDER STAYING CERTAIN  
PROCEEDINGS**

Local Uniform Civil Rule 16(b)(3)(B) provides that “a motion asserting an immunity defense... stays the attorney conference and disclosure requirements and all discovery, pending the court’s ruling on the motion, including any appeal. Whether to permit discovery on issues related to the motion and whether to permit any portion of the case to proceed pending resolution of the motion are decisions committed to the discretion of the court, upon a motion by any party seeking relief.” L. U. CIV. R. 16(b)(3)(B).

A motion asserting an immunity defense has been filed. Doc. #27. Accordingly, staying discovery in this case is appropriate at this time.

If any party desires to take immunity-related discovery, it must file a motion for leave to do so within seven (7) days hereof, setting forth the type and scope of such discovery and an estimated time frame for constructing it. If any party objects to the motion for discovery, it shall file an objection within four (4) days following service of the motion for immunity-related discovery.

**IT IS, THEREFORE, ORDERED** that the aforementioned proceedings are hereby **STAYED** pending a ruling on the motion. Defendants shall notify the undersigned magistrate judge within seven (7) days of a decision on the motion and shall submit a proposed order lifting

the stay.

**SO ORDERED** this, June 3, 2020.

/s/ Jane M. Virden

**UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**